

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/634,693	08/05/2003	Joseph F. Skovira	POU903100US1	7585
46369 7590 08/23/2007 HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & MESITI P.C. 5 COLUMBIA CIRCLE			EXAMINER	
			ZHE, MENG YAO	
ALBANY, NY 12203			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2195	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/23/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/634,693	SKOVIRA, JOSEPH F.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	MengYao Zhe	2109			
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence address			
Period for Reply  A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING E  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUN. 136(a). In no event, however, may a d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO te, cause the application to become	IICATION. a reply be timely filed  DNTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15.	June 2007.				
,	<u> </u>				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
4)	awn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin	ner.				
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documer</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documer</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priapplication from the International Bures</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list</li> </ul>	nts have been received. nts have been received in fority documents have bee au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No en received in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)	A) 🗖 (man-ii-ii-ii				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		w Summary (PTO-413) lo(s)/Mail Date			
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/15/2007.	•	f Informal Patent Application			

Art Unit: 2109

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-3, 6-10, 13-16, 19-20 are presented for examination.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 8, 9, 10, 13, and 14 are rejected because they recite a "system"; however, it appears that the system would reasonably be interpreted by one of ordinary skill in the art as software, per se, failing to be tangibly embodied or include any recited <a href="hardware">hardware</a> as part of the system <i.e. applicant should amend the system to include processor/computer.>.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- 5. Claims 1-3, 6-10, 13-16, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
  - A. The following claim languages are unclear and indefinite:

Art Unit: 2109

i) Claim 1, line 8, it is unclear what is meant by "one or more resources protected by shadow time" <i.e. how is the protection done? Is it that the resources are no longer available after shadow time expires? Or does the system reserve the resources during shadow time?>

Claims 8 and 15 have the same deficiencies as above.

there more than one scheduler in an overall scheduler, and complex scheduler is one of them? And what distinguishes it from a regular, generic scheduler?>

Claims 9 and 16 have the same deficiencies as above.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claims 1-3, 6-10, 13-16, 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeBettencourt et al., Patent No. 6,279,001 (hereafter DeBettencourt) in view of Liu et al., Patent No. 5,031,089 (hereafter Liu).

8. As per claims 1, 8, and 15, DeBettencourt teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a method of balancing workload of a computing environment (abstract, lines 5-6), said method comprising:

Page 4

obtaining, by a manager daemon of one system of a grid computing environment (Fig 1: the manager 110 corresponds to manager daemon; a host correspond to a system in the network, and the network corresponds to the grid computing environment.), scheduler information from a scheduler of another system of the grid computing environment (Column 10, lines 30-36; Column 13, lines 8-25), said scheduler information including job queue of waiting jobs for the another system (Column 13, lines 15-20), shadow time for the next waiting job of the another system indicating how long the job needs to wait for resources, and one or more resources protected by shadow time (Column 13, line 16: queue delay corresponds to shadow time);

performing by the manager daemon workload balancing of at least two systems of the grid computing environment, each system of the at least two systems comprising a scheduler to schedule workload on its system, said workload balancing using at least a portion of the obtained scheduler information (Column 13, lines 20-25)

9. Debettencourt does not teach scheduler information including current free nodes of the another system and wherein the workload balancing comprises backfill scheduling a job, said backfill scheduling allowing the job to run out of order as long as it does not affect the start time of another job scheduled to execute.

Art Unit: 2109

However, Liu teaches scheduler information including current free nodes of the another system (Column 9, lines 35-65) and wherein the workload balancing comprises backfill scheduling a job, said backfill scheduling allowing the job to run out of order as long as it does not affect the start time of another job scheduled to execute (Abstract: transferring task from a heavily loaded queue of a computer to another computer with a under-loaded queue corresponds to backfill scheduling).

- 10. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Debettencourt with scheduler information including current free nodes of the another system and wherein the workload balancing comprises backfill scheduling a job, said backfill scheduling allowing the job to run out of order as long as it does not affect the start time of another job scheduled to execute, as taught by Liu, because it allows load distribution across multiple computers.
- 11. As per claims 2, 9, and 16, DeBettencourt teaches wherein scheduler on each system comprises a complex scheduler (Column 10, lines 30-36; Column 13, lines 8-25: the agent itself corresponds to a complex scheduler).
- 12. As per claims 3 and 10, DeBettencourt teaches wherein scheduler information is obtained from at least two schedulers, and wherein one scheduler of the at least two schedulers is a different scheduler from at least one other scheduler of the at least two

Art Unit: 2109

schedulers (Fig 1: each host has its own queue and scheduler maintained by the agent, which differs from agents of another host).

- 13. As per claims 6, 13, and 19, DeBettencourt teaches wherein the workload balancing includes determining which system of said at least two systems a job is to be assigned; and assigning the job to the determined system (Column 15, lines 40-55;, Column 16, lines 46-56).
- 14. As per claims 7, 14, and 20, Liu teaches wherein the workload balancing includes removing a job from one system of the at least two systems; and assigning the job to another system of the at least two systems (Abstract).

# Response to Arguments

15. Applicant's argument filed on 6/15/2007 regarding to claims 1-3, 6-10, 13-16, 19-20 have been fully considered, but they are most in view of the new ground of rejection.

#### Conclusion

16. Applicants' amendments necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 2109

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MengYao Zhe whose telephone number is 571-272-6946. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday Through Friday, 10:00 - 8:00 EST. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached at 571-272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Mengyao Zhe

MENG-AL T. AN SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINED TECHNOLOGY CENTER 210